

Attractors in coherent systems of differential equations

David Angeli, Dip. di Sistemi e Informatica, University of Firenze
 Morris W. Hirsch, Dep. of Mathematics, University of California Berkeley
 Eduardo D. Sontag, Dep. of Mathematics, Rutgers University

Abstract

Attractors of cooperative dynamical systems are particularly simple; for example, a nontrivial periodic orbit cannot be an attractor. This paper provides characterizations of attractors for the wider class of *coherent* systems, defined by the property that no directed feedback loops are negative. Several new results for cooperative systems are obtained in the process.

Contents

Introduction	2
Statement of results	3
Motivations	4
Structure of proofs	4
Local semiflows	5
Attractors and attracting sets	6
Ordered spaces	6
Cascades	7
Graphs	8
Graphs and systems	10
Spin assignments	11
Monotone dynamics	12
Proofs of the main theorems	16
Appendix: Notes on the development of the concept “attractor”	17

Introduction

We consider differential equations

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x), \quad x \in X, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1)$$

where $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is convex, its interior is dense in X , and the vector field $F: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ extends to a C^1 vector field on an open set. The maximally defined solutions $t \mapsto \Phi_t(a)$, $t \geq 0$, $a \in X$ generate the local semiflow $\Phi := \{\Phi_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$. We refer to F (or $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$, or $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n, \Phi)$) as a *system*. Dynamical notions are applied interchangeably to F and Φ .

Many biological situations are modeled by *cooperative* systems: $\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j} \geq 0$ if $j \neq i$. The biological interpretation is that an increase of species i tends to increase the population growth rate of every other species j . In this case Φ is *monotone*, meaning it preserves the vector ordering. This causes the crude dynamics of a cooperative system to be comparatively simple; for example, there are no attracting cycles and every orbit is nowhere dense (Haderler & Glas [13], Hirsch [16]).

Here we show that some of the dynamical advantages of cooperative systems extend to systems having a significantly weaker property: F is *coherent* (another name is *positive feedback system*) if whenever $i_0, \dots, i_\nu$, $\nu \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ are such that

$$i_\nu = i_0, \quad i_{k-1} \neq i_k \text{ and } \frac{\partial F_{i_{k-1}}}{\partial x_{i_k}} \neq 0 \quad (1 \leq k \leq \nu)$$

then,

$$\frac{\partial F_{i_{k-1}}}{\partial x_{i_k}}(x) \text{ does not change sign} \quad (1 \leq k \leq \nu)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial F_{i_0}}{\partial x_{i_1}}(x) \cdots \frac{\partial F_{i_{\nu-1}}}{\partial x_{i_\nu}}(x) \geq 0, \quad (\forall x \in X). \quad (2)$$

Our chief combinatorial result, Theorem 10, shows that by permuting the variables x_i and changing the signs of some of them, any coherent system can be transformed into a dynamically equivalent system $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n, \Phi)$ with the following properties:

- F is not merely coherent, it has the stronger property of being *quasicooperative*: for any $(i_1, \dots, i_m)$ as above, each factor in the left hand side of (2) is ≥ 0
- if F is not cooperative, there exists a cooperative system $(F^1, X^1, \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, \Phi^1)$, $1 \leq n_1 < n$, such that the the natural projection

$$\Pi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, \quad (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto (x_1, \dots, x_{n_1})$$

maps X onto X^1 and semiconjugates F to F^1 and Φ to Φ^1 :

$$\Pi \circ F(x) = F^1 \circ \Pi(x), \quad \Pi \circ \Phi_t(x) = \Phi_t^1 \circ \Pi(x) \text{ if } \Phi_t(x) \text{ is defined}$$

Mild geometrical conditions on X guarantee that for each equilibrium p of F^1 , the restriction of F to $X_p := X \cap \Pi^{-1}(p)$ is equivalent to a quasicoperative system $(\hat{F}_p, \hat{X}_p, \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1})$. This is the basis for inductive proofs of our main results.

We turn to our main topic, attractors. An *attractor* for F is a nonempty invariant continuum $A \subset X$ that uniformly attracts all points in some neighborhood of A . If the attraction is not necessarily uniform we talk instead of an *attracting set*. Three types of attractors A have received special attention:

Point attractors: A is single point, necessarily an equilibrium.

Periodic attractors: A is a cycle, i.e., a periodic orbit that is not an equilibrium.

Strange attractors, often called “chaotic”. This somewhat vague term signifies that A is neither an equilibrium nor a cycle, and usually that A is topologically transitive and exhibits “sensitive dependence on initial conditions”. Some authors also require that periodic orbits be dense in A .

This paper is motivated by the question: What kind of nonequilibrium attractors A can exist in coherent systems? Theorem 1 shows that A cannot be topologically transitive; Theorems 2 and 3 give further dynamical information. Other results apply to more general monotone local semiflows.

Statement of results

A set is *finitely transitive* for a system (or a local semiflow) if it is the union of the omega limit sets of finitely many of its points.

Theorem 1 *A finitely transitive attracting set A for a system $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ reduces to an equilibrium in the following cases:*

- (i) *F is coherent, and X is open in $\mathbb{R}^n$ or relatively open in a coordinate half-space*
- (ii) *F is quasicoperative, and every point of A is strongly accessible in X from above, or every point of A is strongly accessible in X from below*
- (iii) *F is cooperative, and each point of A is strongly accessible in X from above or below*

A stronger conclusion, Theorem 16, holds for cooperative systems.

The following result requires no additional geometrical conditions on X :

Theorem 2 *If $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $n \geq 2$ is a coherent system, every orbit is nowhere dense.*

Conjecture *In a coherent system with $n > 1$, every orbit closure has measure zero. Even for cooperative systems this is known only for $n = 2$.*

An attractor is *global* if it attracts all points of X . An equilibrium is *globally asymptotically stable* if it is the global attractor. The following theorem needs X to be open:

Theorem 3 *Let $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a coherent system with X open in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Assume there exists a global attractor A . Then there exists an equilibrium, and if it is unique it is globally asymptotically stable.*

Proposition 14 extends a basic result previously known only for strongly order-preserving local semiflows. The development of the concept “attractor” is discussed in the Appendix.

Motivations

A coherent system is one whose interaction graph (defined below) has no directed negative loops. A more restrictive condition, for graphs that are not necessarily strongly connected, is the requirement that the graph has no *undirected* negative loops: in that case, one may always perform an elementary change of variables (defined below) that transforms such a system into a cooperative one. In a classical and often-quoted 1981 paper, R. Thomas conjectured that coherent systems do not have any periodic attractors: “the presence of at least one negative loop in the logical structure appears as a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for a permanent periodic behavior” [48]. It has often been claimed (see e.g. [30]) that Thomas’ conjecture was settled in [41, 12]. However, these references only dealt with the more restricted monotone case. Theorem 1 in this paper settles the question. We refer the reader to [42] for further comments on the relevance of these concepts to molecular systems biology, and to [43] for numerical simulations which suggest that systems that are “close” to having the coherence property might have, in some statistical sense, simpler attractors.

Structure of proofs

The proofs of Theorems 1, 2 and 3 have a common pattern which we now discuss. Let $\mathcal{T}$ stand for one of these theorems. It is proved first for a cooperative system, which includes the case $n = 1$. The proof proceeds by induction on n . A coherent system which is not cooperative is transformed, by permuting and changing signs of variables, to a system $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ having the following properties:

- F is quasicooperative
- there is a system $(F^1, X^1, \mathbb{R}^{n_1})$ with $n_1 < n$, such that the natural projection $\Pi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ satisfies
$$\Pi(X) = X^1, \quad \Pi \circ F(x) = F \circ \Pi(x), \quad (x \in X) \quad (3)$$
- F^1 is cooperative

It follows that Π semiconjugates the local semiflow Φ of F to the local semiflow Φ^1 of F^1 :

$$\Pi \circ \Phi_t(x) = \Phi_t^1 \circ \Pi(x) \text{ if } \Phi_t(x) \text{ is defined} \quad (4)$$

We summarize this by saying that $\Pi: (F, X, \mathbb{R}^n) \twoheadrightarrow (F^1, X^1, \mathbb{R}^{n_1})$ (or $\Pi: F \twoheadrightarrow F^1$) is a *cascade*. We also allow the *trivial* cascade, for which $F = F^1$.

For each equilibrium p of F^1 the affine subspace $E_p := \Pi^{-1}(p)$ is a coset of the kernel of Π . The *canonical chart*

$$T_p: E_p \approx \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1}, \quad (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto (x_{n_1+1}, \dots, x_n) \quad (5)$$

is an affine automorphism.

The vector field F , being tangent to E_p along X_p , restricts to a vector field F_p in $X_p := X \cap E_p$, and Φ restricts to a local semiflow Φ_p in X_p . The hypothesis of $\mathcal{T}$ will ensure that the relative interior of X_p in E_p is dense in X_p . The canonical chart converts the *fibre system* (F_p, X_p, E_p) into a system $(\hat{F}_p, \hat{X}_p, \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1})$.

We identify each fibre system (F_p, X_p, E_p) with $(\hat{F}_p, \hat{X}_p, \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1})$ by means of the canonical chart. Thus F_p has an interaction graph $\Gamma(F_p) := \Gamma(\hat{F}_p)$. We ascribe to F_p the property of being cooperative, quasicooperative or coherent whenever that property holds for $\hat{F}_p$.

Theorem $\mathcal{T}$ holds for the cooperative system F^1 , and it holds for all fibre systems by the inductive assumption. The induction is completed by showing that this implies $\mathcal{T}$ also holds for $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

There is a delicate point regarding the domains of these systems. The proofs for cooperative systems use special properties of X , such as every point being strongly accessible from above. These properties are postulated in the hypotheses of the main theorems. To make the induction work, the same properties must be verified for the systems obtained by elementary coordinate changes, and also for fibre systems. This means that the class of domains X referred to in the theorems must be preserved by permuting and changing signs of variables, and by intersecting X with the affine subspaces E_p . For this reason X is usually required to be an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ or a relatively open subset of a coordinate halfspace.

Local semiflows

A *local semiflow* Φ in a metrizable space Z is a collection $\Phi = \{\Phi_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ of continuous maps $\Phi_t: D_t \rightarrow R_t$ between nonempty subsets of Z , with D_t open. The notation $\Phi_t x$ indicates $x \in D_t$, absent contraindications. Φ is required to have the following properties:

- The set $\Omega := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times Z: x \in D_t\}$ is an open neighborhood of $\{0\} \times Z$ in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times Z$, and the map $\Omega \rightarrow Z$, $(t, x) \mapsto \Phi_t x$ is continuous.
- $x \in (\Phi_s)^{-1} D_t \implies \Phi_s \circ \Phi_t(x) = \Phi_{s+t}(x)$
- Φ_0 is the identity map of Z .

We also say that (Φ, Z) is a local semiflow. When Φ is obtained by solving Equation (1) each map Φ_t is a homeomorphism, but this is not assumed for general local semiflows.

The *orbit* and *omega limit set* of x are respectively

$$\gamma(x) := \{\Phi_t x : x \in D_t\}, \quad \omega(x) := \bigcap_{t \geq 0} \overline{\gamma(\Phi_t x)}$$

p is an *equilibrium* if $\Phi_t p = p$ for all t . The set of equilibria is denoted by $\mathcal{E}(\Phi)$, and by $\mathcal{E}(F)$ when Φ is generated by the vector field F .

Attractors and attracting sets

We call A *positively invariant* for if $\Phi_t(a)$ is defined and belongs to A for all $t \geq 0$, $a \in A$, and *invariant* if in addition A is nonempty and $\Phi_t(A) = A$ for all $t \geq 0$. We say that A *attracts* x if $\overline{\gamma(x)}$ is compact and $\omega(x) \subset A$. The set of such points y is the *basin* of A .

A is *topologically transitive* if it is the omega limit set of one of its points, and *finitely transitive* if it is the union of the omega limit sets of finitely many of its points.

We call A *attracting* if it is invariant, connected and compact, and its basin is a neighborhood of A . If in addition A has arbitrarily small positively invariant neighborhoods, A is an *attractor*.¹

Ordered spaces

By an *ordered space* we mean a topological space Z together an order relation $\mathcal{R} \subset Z \times Z$ that is topologically closed. If $x, y \in Z$ we write:

$$x \geq y \text{ and } y \leq x \text{ if } (x, y) \in \mathcal{R}, \quad x > y \text{ and } y < x \text{ if } x \geq y, x \neq y \quad (6)$$

The *vector order* in any subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by

$$u \geq v \iff u - v \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$$

where $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ denotes the the positive orthant $[0, \infty)^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

A subset of an ordered space is *unordered* if none of its points are related by $>$.

Every subspace $X \subset Z$ inherits an order relation from Z . If $M \subset Z$ then $x > M$ means $x > y$ for all $y \in M$, and similarly for the other relations in (6). For $x, y \in X$ we write

$$\begin{aligned} x \triangleright_X y &\text{ if } x > N, y \in \text{Int}_X(N), \\ x \triangleleft_X y &\text{ if } x < N, y \in \text{Int}_X(N) \end{aligned}$$

for some open $N \subset X$. Note the notational anomaly that $x \triangleright_X y$ and $y \triangleleft_X x$ are not equivalent statements for general ordered spaces. They are equivalent, however, if $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is open and has the vector ordering. For example, in $X = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ we have $(0, 0) \triangleleft_X (0, 1)$ but $(0, 1) \not\triangleright_X (0, 0)$.

¹There are many definitions of “attractor” in current use, not mutually consistent. The one adopted here is equivalent to that of Conley [10], and (for compact invariant sets) those of Hale [14] and Sell & You [38]. It is analogous to the definitions for discrete-time systems in Smale [39] and Akin [1].

Let X be a subset of an ordered space Z . We call $q \in X$ *strongly accessible in X from above (respectively, from below)* if every neighborhood of q in X contains a point $x \triangleright_X q$ (respectively, $x \triangleleft_X q$).²

All our results are valid when X is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and some are valid for special kinds of nonopen sets, especially open subsets of a *coordinate halfspace* of $\mathbb{R}^n$, which means a set

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \alpha x_l \geq c_l\}$$

for some choice of $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\alpha \in \{\pm 1\}$, $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We rely on the following fact, whose proof is left to the reader:

Lemma 4 *Assume $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ has the vector ordering. If X is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, or a relatively open subset of a coordinate halfspace, every point of X is strongly accessible from above and below in X .* ■

Note also that if X is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}_+^n$, all points of X are strongly accessible in X from above.

Cascades

Let $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $(F^1, X^1, \mathbb{R}^{n_1})$ be systems with $1 \leq n_1 < n$ and assume $\Pi: F \twoheadrightarrow F^1$ is a cascade (see (3)). This implies

$$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j} = 0 \text{ if } i \leq n_1 < j, \quad (i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}) \quad (7)$$

and the Jacobian matrices of F have lower triangular block decompositions of the form

$$F'(x) = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11}(x) & O \\ M_{21}(x) & M_{22}(x) \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where $M_{11}(x) = (F^1)'(\Pi x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$, and O stands for a matrix of zeroes. The following diagrams commute for each $t \geq 0$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D(\Phi_t) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_t} & R(\Phi_t) \\ \Pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi \\ D(\Phi_t^1) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_t^1} & R(\Phi_t^1) \end{array}$$

For $p \in \mathcal{E}(F^1)$ let $T_p: E_p \approx \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1}$ be the canonical chart. Set $\hat{X}_p = T_p(X_p)$ and define $\hat{F}_p: \hat{X}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1}$ to be the unique vector field transformed by $(T_p)^{-1}$ to F_p , that is,

²Slightly stronger properties with the same names are used in Hirsch & Smith [20].

$$\hat{F}(T_p x) = T_p F(x), \quad (x \in X_p) \quad (9)$$

The local semiflows of F_p and $\hat{F}_p$ are conjugate under T_p . For $(\hat{F}_p, \hat{X}_p, \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1})$ to be a system it is necessary and sufficient that the relative interior of X_p in E_p be dense in E_p . When this holds we call (F_p, X_p, E_p) the *fibre system* over p and identify it with $(\hat{F}_p, \hat{X}_p, \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1})$ by T_p .

The interaction graph $\Gamma(F_p) := \Gamma(\hat{F}_p)$ is determined by the signs of the entries in the block $M_{22}(x)$ in (8). The next lemma gives convenient conditions ensuring this.

Consider the following conditions:

- $C_1(X, \mathbb{R}^n)$: X is open in $\mathbb{R}^n$
- $C_2(X, \mathbb{R}^n)$: X is open in a coordinate halfspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$
- $C_3(X, \mathbb{R}^n)$: X is open in $\mathbb{R}_+^n$
- $C_4(X, \mathbb{R}^n)$: X is a rectangle

Lemma 5 Assume Π : $F \rightarrow F^1$ a cascade as above and $p \in \mathcal{E}(F^1)$. Suppose $p \in \mathcal{E}(F^1)$, and $C_d(X, \mathbb{R}^n)$, is satisfied for some $d \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then $(\hat{F}_p, \hat{X}_p, \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1})$ is a system, and $C_d(\hat{X}_p, \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1})$ holds.

Proof The verification that $C_d(X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ implies $C_d(\hat{X}_p, \mathbb{R}^{n-n_1})$, and also that relative interior of X_p in E_p is dense in X_p , is straightforward. ■

Graphs

By a *directed graph* $\Gamma := (V_\Gamma, E_\Gamma)$ we mean a nonempty finite set $V := V_\Gamma$ (the set of vertices) together with a binary relation $E := E_\Gamma \subset V \times V$ (the set of *directed edges*, usually referred to simply as “edges”). We always assume E is totally nonreflexive i.e., $(i, i) \notin E$.

An *isomorphism* between a pair of directed graphs is a bijection f between their vertex sets such that $f \times f$ restricts to a bijection f_* between their edge sets.

Our chief tool for analyzing the crude dynamics of systems $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the *interaction graph* $\Gamma := \Gamma(F)$. This is the labeled directed graph with vertex set is $V = V(\Gamma) := \{1, \dots, n\}$, whose set of (directed) edges is

$$E = E(\Gamma) := \{(j, i) \in V \times V : j \neq i \text{ and } \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j} \text{ is not identically 0 in } X\}$$

Edge (j, i) is assigned the label $h(j, i) \in \{+1, -1, \theta\}$ according to the rule:

$$h(j, i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in X, \\ -1 & \text{if } \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}(x) \leq 0 \text{ for all } x \in X, \\ \theta & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

and is respectively called positive, negative or ambiguous. A loop is *positive* if each of its edges is labeled +1 or −1 and the product of these labels is +1.

We define three types of graphs in increasing order of generality:

Γ is *positive* if every edge is positive,

Γ is *quasipositive* if every loop has only positive edges,

Γ has the *positive loop property* if every loop is positive.

Paraphrasing some of the earlier definitions, we define corresponding types of systems F in terms of $\Gamma(F)$:

F is *cooperative* if $\Gamma(F)$ is positive

F is *quasicooperative* if $\Gamma(F)$ is quasipositive,

F is *coherent* if Γ has the positive loop property

Evidently *cooperative* $\implies$ *quasicooperative* $\implies$ *coherent*.

The term “graph” is shorthand for “finite directed graph having edges labeled in $\{1, -1, \theta\}$.” Graphs are denoted by Greek capitals Γ, Λ , perhaps with indices. The sets of vertices and edges of Γ are denoted by $V(\Gamma)$ and $E(\Gamma)$, respectively, and the labeling function is denoted by $h_\Gamma: V(\Gamma) \rightarrow \{1, -1, \theta\}$. Two graphs Γ, Λ are *isomorphic* if there there is an isomorphism $f: V(\Gamma) \rightarrow V(\Lambda)$ between the underlying directed graphs such that $h_\Lambda \circ f_* = h_\Gamma$.

Λ is a *subgraph* of Γ provided

$$V(\Lambda) \subset V(\Gamma), \quad E(\Lambda) \subset E(\Gamma), \quad h_\Lambda = h_\Gamma|_{E(\Lambda)},$$

We abuse notation and denote this by $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$, saying that Λ contained in Γ .

If Λ, Λ' are subgraphs their *graph union* is the subgraph with vertex set $V(\Lambda) \cup V(\Lambda')$ and edge set $E(\Lambda) \cup E(\Lambda')$.

A *path* of length $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ is a sequence $(u_0, \dots, u_k)$ of vertices such that (v_{j-1}, v_j) is an edge for $j = 1, \dots, k$. The *concatenation* of an ordered pair (λ, μ) of paths,

$$\lambda = (u_0, \dots, u_k), \quad \mu = (u_k, \dots, u_{k+l}),$$

is the path

$$\lambda \cdot \mu := (u_0, \dots, u_k, u_{k+1}, \dots, u_{k+l})$$

obtained by transversing first λ and then μ .

A *loop* of length $\mu \in \mathbb{N}_+$ is a sequence of $\mu \geq 2$ edges having the form

$$(i_0, i_1), (i_1, i_2), \dots, (i_{\mu-1}, i_\mu), \quad i_\mu = i_0$$

As our graphs are totally nonreflexive, there are no self-loops: $i_j \neq i_{j-1}$, $j = 1, \dots, \mu$.

A loop is *positive* (respectively, *negative*) if each of its edges is labeled 1 or −1 and the product of these labels is +1 (respectively, −1). All other loops are *ambiguous*.

In the next three definitions the labeling plays no role. A graph is called:

connected if for each pair of distinct vertices j, k there is a sequence of vertices $j = i_0, \dots, i_m = k$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that (i_{l-1}, i_l) or (i_l, i_{l-1}) is an edge of Λ , $(l = 1, \dots, m)$

strongly connected if for any ordered pair (a, b) of distinct vertices there is a path in Λ from a to b ,

primary if every edge belongs to a loop,

These definitions imply:

- A graph with no edges is primary, but a graph with only one edge is not primary.
- The graph union of primary subgraphs is primary.
- A strongly connected subgraph is primary, and a primary connected subgraph having more than one vertex is strongly connected. If Γ is quasipositive, every primary subgraph is positive.

A subgraph $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$ is called:

- *full* provided it contains all edges in Γ joining vertices of Λ ,
- *initial* if no edge of Γ is directed from a vertex outside Λ to a vertex of Λ ,
- *terminal* if if no directed edge of Γ joins a vertex of Λ to a vertex not in Λ ,
- *fundamental* if is connected, primary and initial, and no other subgraph containing Λ has these properties.

Lemma 6 *The following hold for all subgraphs:*

- (a) *fundamental subgraphs are full*
- (b) *if fundamental subgraphs Λ_1, Λ_2 share a vertex, they coincide*
- (c) *every connected, primary, initial subgraph is contained in a unique fundamental subgraph*

Proof (a) and (b) follow directly from definitions. (c) is proved by showing that the graph union of a maximal nested family of connected, primary, initial subgraphs is fundamental. ■

Graphs and systems

Let $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a system.

Proposition 7 *If $\Pi: F \rightarrow F^1$ is a cascade having a fibre system F_p , then:*

- (a) $\Gamma(F^1)$ is a full subgraph of $\Gamma(F)$.
- (b) $\Gamma(F_p)$ is isomorphic to a subgraph of $\Gamma(F)$.

(c) when F is cooperative, quasicooperative or coherent, F^1 and F_p have the same property.

Proof (a) and (b), which imply (c), are proved by inspecting the block decomposition (8) of the matrix of functions $F'(x)$. ■

Proposition 8 Let $\Gamma^1 \subset \Gamma(F)$ be an initial full subgraph such that $V(\Gamma_1) = \{1, \dots, n_1\}$. Then:

- (i) there is a cascade $\Pi: (F, X, \mathbb{R}^n) \rightrightarrows (F^1, X^1, \mathbb{R}^{n_1})$ such that $\Gamma(F^1) = \Gamma^1$.
- (ii) When F is quasicooperative, F^1 and all fibre systems are quasicooperative, and if Γ_1 is primary then F^1 is cooperative

Proof Initiality and fullness of Γ^1 means that (7) holds. Therefore (3) defines a cascade satisfying (i). The first assertion in (ii) follows from Proposition 7(c). The second assertion holds because Γ_1 is quasipositive, and if it is primary all its edges are in loops and hence are positive. ■

Spin assignments

A *spin assignment* for a graph Γ is any function $\sigma: V(\Gamma) \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$. It is *consistent* if $h(u, v) = \sigma(u)\sigma(v)$ for every edge (u, v) belonging to a loop. (This terminology is not the same as in [42], where it was required that every edge be consistent. With that stronger requirement, the theorem given below would become a characterization of monotonicity with respect to an orthant order, a more restrictive property than coherence.)

Theorem 9 Γ has the positive loop property if and only if it has a consistent spin assignment.

Proof Assume Γ has the positive loop property. Let Γ' be obtained from Γ by keeping the same vertices but deleting the edges not contained in loops. Clearly Γ' has the positive loop property, and if σ is a consistent spin assignment on Γ' it is also consistent on Γ . Therefore we can assume every edge e belongs to a loop and is thus positive.

Claim: If λ^1, λ^2 are paths from a to b then $h(\lambda^1) = h(\lambda^2) \in \{\pm 1\}$. To see this, choose a path μ from b to a , which can be done because each edge belongs to a loop. Since every loop is positive by hypothesis, for $j = 1, 2$ we have

$$1 = h(\lambda^j \cdot \mu) = h(\lambda^j)h(\mu)$$

Therefore $h(\lambda^1) = h(\mu) = h(\lambda^2)$.

Now fix a vertex p of Γ and for each vertex v choose a path λ_v from p to v . Define $\sigma(p) = 1$ and $\sigma(v) = h(\lambda_v)$, which by the claim is independent of the choice of λ_v . For any edge $e = (u, v)$ we can fix λ_u and define $\lambda_v := \lambda_u \cdot e$. Then have:

$$\sigma(u) = h(\lambda_u), \quad \sigma(v) = h(\lambda_u \cdot e) = h(\lambda_u)h(e),$$

which implies $h(e) = \sigma(u)\sigma(v)$. The converse implication is left to the reader. ■

Remark The foregoing proof can be expressed homologically. Let $\hat{\Lambda}$ denote the 1-dimensional cell complex corresponding to a prime subgraph $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$ having the vertices of Λ for 0-cells and the directed edges of Λ for 1-cells. In the cellular chain groups of $\hat{\Lambda}$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_2$ (identified with the multiplicative group $\{\pm 1\}$), a labeling h is a 1-cochain, spin assignments are 0-cocycles, and a spin assignment σ is consistent for h if its coboundary is $\delta\sigma = h$. As the evaluation of cochains on chains induces a dual pairing $H^1(\hat{\Lambda}; \mathbb{Z}_2) \times H_1(\hat{\Lambda}; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$, the positive loop property makes the cohomology class of h trivial. Thus $h = \delta\sigma$, proving that σ is consistent.

A change of variables $x \mapsto y$ is called *elementary* if there is a permutation $i \mapsto i'$ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and an n -tuple $\rho \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ such that $y_i = \rho_i x_{i'}$.

Theorem 10 *If a system is coherent, there is an elementary change of variables transforming it to a quasicoperative system admitting a cascade over a cooperative system for which all fibre systems are quasicoperative.*

Proof Assume $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a coherent system, which by Theorem 9 has a consistent spin assignment σ . The elementary change of variables $L: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$y = Lx, \quad y_i := \sigma(i)x_i$$

transforms $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ into a system

$$(G, L(X), \mathbb{R}^n), \quad L \circ G \text{ ***}$$

such that $\Gamma(G)$ and $\Gamma(F)$ have the same undirected edges. For every directed edge (j, i) of $\Gamma(G)$:

$$h_{\Gamma(G)}(j, i) = \text{sign}\left(\frac{\partial G_j}{\partial y_i}\right) = \sigma_j \sigma_i \text{sign}\left(\frac{\partial F_j}{\partial x_i}\right) \sigma_j \sigma_i h_{\Gamma(F)}(j, i)$$

If (j, i) belongs to a loop then $h_{\Gamma(F)}(j, i) = \sigma_j \sigma_i$ by the consistency condition. Therefore

$$\text{sign}\left(\frac{\partial G_j}{\partial y_i}\right)(\sigma_j \sigma_i)^2 = (\pm 1)^2 = 1,$$

showing that G is quasicoperative. After reindexing variables we assume there is a fundamental subgraph $\Gamma^1 \subset \Gamma(F)$ with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n_1\}$, $1 \leq n_1 \leq n$. Now apply Proposition 8. ■

Monotone dynamics

A local semiflow Φ is *monotone* if $x \geq y \implies \Phi_t x \geq \Phi_t y$. Throughout this section we assume:

- $\Phi := \{\Phi_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a monotone local semiflow in an ordered space X

To simplify notation we may write $x(t) := \Phi_t x$ whenever $\Phi_t x$ is defined. It is well known for the data in Equation (1) that if F is cooperative and X is convex, the corresponding local semiflow Φ is monotone. This is a corollary of the Müller-Kamke theorem [28, 21] on differential inequalities (Hirsch [16]).

Proposition 11 *The following are true for all $x \in X$:*

(a) *No points of $\omega(x)$ are related by $\triangleright_X$ or $\triangleleft_X$*

(b) *$\omega(x)$ is a singleton in the following cases:*

(i) *$\overline{\gamma(x)}$ is compact and there exist $t_* \geq 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$t_* < t < t_* + \varepsilon \implies \Phi_t x < x \text{ or } \Phi_t x > x$$

(ii) *$\overline{\gamma(x)}$ is compact and there exist $t > 0$ such that*

$$\Phi_t x \triangleright_X x \text{ or } \Phi_t x \triangleleft_X x$$

Proof (a) and (b)(i) are sharpenings of Hirsch & Smith [20, Theorems 1.8, 1.4], respectively. Assertion (b)(ii) follows from (b)(i). ■

Proposition 12 *Assume $A \subset X$ is attracting.*

(a) *If each point of A is strongly accessible in X from either above or below, then A contains an equilibrium.*

(b) *If each point of A is strongly accessible in X from both above and below and $A \cap \mathcal{E} = p$ then $A = p$.*

Proof This is a slight generalization of Hirsch [17, Theorems III.3.1 and III.3.3], and the same proofs work here. ■

Proposition 13 *Assume $A \subset \omega(x)$. Let $q \in A$ be a minimal (respectively, maximal) point of A having a neighborhood $N \subset X$ such that there is a point $y < N$ (respectively, $y > N$) is attracted to A . Then $q = \inf A$ (respectively, $q = \sup A$).*

Proof To fix ideas we assume q is a minimal point of A and $y < N$. Notation is simplified by setting $\Phi_t w = w(t)$ whenever $w \in X, t \geq 0$.

Some point on $\gamma(x)$ lies in N its omega limit set contains A . Replacing x by such a point we assume $x \in N$. Therefore $y < x$ and

$$y(t) < x(t), \quad (t \geq 0) \tag{11}$$

There is a sequence $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $x(t_n) \in N$ and

$$x(t_n) \rightarrow q \quad (12)$$

Because $\omega(y)$ meets A we can choose this sequence so that also

$$y(t_n) \rightarrow a \in A \quad (13)$$

It follows from (11), (12), (13) and closedness of the order relation that $a \leq q$, so minimality of q implies $a = q$. Thus

$$y(t_n) \rightarrow q \in \mathcal{E} \quad (14)$$

Choose n_0 so that $y(t_{n_0}) \in N$. If $I \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ is a sufficiently small open interval about t_{n_0} then $s \in I \implies y(s) \in N$, hence $y(s) > y$. The dual of Proposition 11(b)(i) now shows that $\omega(y)$ is an equilibrium, hence $\omega(y) = \{q\}$. It follows from (11) that $\omega(x) > q$, hence $A \geq q$. ■

In the rest of this section we assume:

- $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with the vector ordering.

Proposition 14 Assume $x \in \omega(A)$, $\omega(x) = A$. If $\inf A = p$ or $\sup A = p$ then $A = p$.

This result also holds when X is ordered by a solid polyhedral cone, but it has not been proved for more general ordered spaces. For strongly order-preserving local semiflows a stronger conclusion holds: Every omega limit set is unordered (Hirsch & Smith [20, Corollary 1.9]).

Proof For any $\Sigma \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ the corresponding *face* of $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ is

$$J := J(\Sigma) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : z_i > 0 \implies i \in \Sigma\}$$

When $\Sigma \neq \emptyset$ the corresponding *open face* is

$$J^\circ := J^\circ(\Sigma) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : z_i > 0 \iff i \in \Sigma\}$$

It can be seen that $\overline{J^\circ} = J$ and J° is relatively open in its linear span. Moreover

$$(\forall z \in J^\circ) (\exists \delta > 0) \quad z > J \cap N_\delta(0) \quad (15)$$

Fix $x, p \in X$ such that $\inf \omega(x) = p$ or $\sup \omega(x) = p$; we have to prove $\omega(x) = p$. To fix ideas we assume $p = 0 = \inf \omega(x)$. *Claim:* $\Phi_t(x)$ is defined for all $t \geq 0$. It is well known that this is the case if the orbit closure of x is compact. If it is not compact, the orbit intersects the boundary of some open ball centered at 0 in an infinite set. Consequently $\omega(x)$ contains a point $\neq p$, which implies the claim.

For any $I \subset [0, \infty)$ set $\Phi(I, x) := \{\Phi_t(x) : t \in I\}$. By the Baire category theorem there is a dense open subset $S \subset [0, \infty)$ such that for each component I of S there is a unique open face $J_I^\circ \supset \Phi(I, x)$.

There is a sequence $\{I_k\}$ of these components and points $t_k \in I_k$ such that as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$t_k \rightarrow \infty, \quad x(t_k) > 0, \quad x(t_k) \rightarrow 0$$

After passing to a subsequence we can assume there is an open face K^o such that $J_{I_k}^o = K^o$ for all k . Choose such a K^o having the largest possible dimension. Then $x(t) \in K^o$ for sufficiently large t . For if $x(t_0) \in K^o$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is such that $x(t) \notin K^o$ for $t \in (t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon]$, then $x(t')$ for some $t' \in (t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon]$ belongs to an open face of larger dimension, and this can only happen finitely many times. Set $\dim K^o = m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and relabel variables so that $K^o = K^o(\{1, \dots, m\})$.

By (15) there exists $t_* > 0$ such that

$$t > t_* \implies x(t_*) > x(t) > 0$$

By Proposition 11(b)(i) the trajectory of $x(t_*)$ converges, necessarily to 0. Therefore $\omega(x) = \omega(x(t_*)) = 0$. ■

Corollary 15 Assume $0 \in X \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$. If $0 \in \omega(x)$, then $0 = \omega(x)$. ■

Proof Follows from Theorem 14 because $0 = \inf \omega(x)$. ■

Remark We digress to interpret this result biologically. Let $x_i \geq 0$ stand for the “size” of species i (population, biomass, density, ...) and call $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ the “total size”. Assume that from each initial state $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ the species develop along a curve $x(t) = (x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t)) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n, t \geq 0$ governed by a cooperative system (suggesting symbiosis or commensalism) in $\mathbb{R}_+^n$. Then:

- If the total population does not die out, the total size is bounded above 0.

This follows from the contrapositive of the Corollary.

The next result will be used to start the inductive proof of Theorem 1. It applies only to cooperative systems, but the assumptions on Φ , X and A are weaker than in Theorem 1. Recall that every nonempty compact set in an ordered space contains a maximum point and a minimum point (Ward [51]),

Theorem 16 Assume $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ has the vector ordering and Φ is a monotone local semiflow in X . Let $A \subset X$ be attracting and finitely transitive for Φ . If every point of A is strongly accessible in X from above or below, then $A \in \mathcal{E}$.

More precisely: If $q \in A$ is maximal and strongly accessible in X from above then $A = q$. Likewise if $q \in A$ is minimal and strongly accessible in X from below.

Proof It suffices to assume $q \in A$ is maximal and strongly accessible in X from above. Under the current assumptions there exist $x \in A, y \in X$ and neighborhood $U \subset X$ of q such that $q \in \omega(x)$, $y \succ q$ and y is attracted to A . Evidently q is maximal in $\omega(x)$, hence $q = \sup \omega(x)$ by Proposition 13, and therefore $q = \omega(x)$ by Theorem 14.

Suppose $z \in X$ and $\omega(z) \cap U \neq \emptyset$. There exists $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $z(t_l) \in U$, hence $y(t) \triangleright_X z(t + l)$, ($t \geq 0$), and monotonicity proves

$$\omega(z) \cap U \neq \emptyset \implies \omega(z) \leq q \quad (16)$$

Now we prove for all $v \in X$:

$$q \in \omega(v) \implies q = \omega(v) \quad (17)$$

For there exists $z \in \gamma(v) \cap U$ and Equation (16) implies $q = \sup \omega(z)$, hence $q = \omega(z) = \omega(v)$ by Theorem 14.

Let $\{a_k\}$ be any sequence in $U \cap A$ converging to q . By hypothesis there is a finite set $S \subset X$ such that each a_k is an omega limit point of some member of S . By finiteness of S there is a subsequence $\{b_k\}$ of $\{a_k\}$ and $v \in S$ such that $\{b_k\} \subset \omega(v)$. Evidently $q \in \omega(v)$, whence $q = \omega(v)$ by (17). This can only happen if $b_k = q$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$. It follows that q is isolated in the connected set A , entailing $A = q$. ■

Proofs of the main theorems

Proof of Theorem 1 Let the system $(F, X, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be as in Theorem 1, with a finitely transitive attracting set $A \subset X$.

Step (i) Consider first the case that F is cooperative. Then Φ is monotone because X is convex, and each of the assumptions (i), (ii) implies each point of A is strongly accessible in X from above or below. The conclusion for this case follows from Proposition 16.

Step (ii) We proceed by induction on n , the case $n = 1$ following from the cooperative case. Assume inductively that $n > 1$ and that the conclusion holds for smaller values of n . By Step (i) we can assume F is not cooperative, whence by Theorem 10 there is a cooperative system $(F^1, X^1, \mathbb{R}^{n_1})$ and a cascade $\Pi: F \twoheadrightarrow F^1$ with $1 \leq n_1 < n$, whose fibre systems are quasicoperative. Lemma 5 shows that (F_p, X_p, E_p) is a fibre system for each $p \in \mathcal{E}(F^1)$.

The set $\Pi(A) \subset X^1$ is finitely transitive for the cooperative system F^1 , hence $\Pi(A) = p \in \mathcal{E}(F^1)$ by Step (i). Thus A lies in the invariant set $X_p = X \cap Q^{-1}(A)$, and A is attracting and finitely transitive for $\Phi_p := \Phi|_{X_p}$. The inductive hypothesis applied to (F_p, X_p, E_p) shows that A is an equilibrium, completing the induction. ■

Proof of Theorem 2 Consider first the case that F is cooperative. Assume *per contra* that the orbit closure of $x \in X$ contains a nonempty open subset $U \subset X$. As some open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is dense in X we can assume U is open in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The orbit $\gamma(x)$, being a smooth

curve, is nowhere dense in U because $n \geq 2$. Therefore $U \subset \omega(x)$, hence $\omega(x)$ contains points a, b such that $a \triangleright_x b$. But this contradicts Proposition 11(a).

Now assume F is not cooperative. By Theorem 10 there is a cascade $\Pi: F \rightarrow F^1$ with F^1 cooperative. If $W \subset X$ is open and γ is an orbit of F , then $\Pi(W)$ is open in X^1 and $\Pi(\gamma)$ is an orbit of F^1 . The cooperative case shows that $\Pi(\gamma) \cap \Pi(W)$ is not dense in $\Pi(W)$ and therefore $\gamma \cap W$ is not dense in W . ■

Proof of Theorem 3 If F is cooperative, as when $n = 1$, the conclusion follows from Proposition 12. We proceed by induction on n , assuming that $n > 1$ and the theorem holds for smaller values.

We can assume F is not cooperative. By Theorem 10 there is a cascade $\Pi: F \rightarrow F^1$ cooperative system $(F^1, X^1, \mathbb{R}^{n_1})$ with F^1 cooperative and $1 \leq n_1 < n$, such that if $p \in \mathcal{E}(F^1)$ then (F_p, X_p, E_p) is a quasicoperative system. Applying the inductive hypothesis twice, we conclude that there exists $p \in \mathcal{E}(F^1)$ and $q \in \mathcal{E}(F_p) \subset \mathcal{E}(F)$.

Assume $\mathcal{E}(F) = q$ and set $\Pi(q) = p' \in \mathcal{E}(F^1)$. Then $p' = p$. For we showed above that every fibre system contains an equilibrium of F , which must be q . Thus $\Pi^{-1}(p')$ and $\Pi^{-1}(p)$ are not disjoint, hence they coincide and Π maps both of them to p .

By the inductive hypothesis p is the global attractor for F^1 , therefore X_p attracts all points of X by Equation (4). This implies A is the global attractor for $\Phi|_{X_p}$, and the inductive hypothesis applied to (F_p, X_p, E_p) shows that $A = q$. ■

Appendix: Notes on the development of the concept “attractor”

In spite of the fact that everyone who is interested in dynamics has a more or less vague intuition of what an attractor of a map $f: M \rightarrow M$ should be, there is no generally accepted mathematical definition for this concept even if M is a smooth manifold and f is also smooth.
—H. Bothe [4]

The first mathematical use of the word “attractor” may be in Coddington & Levinson’s 1955 book [9], where it refers to an asymptotically stable equilibrium. The term was subsequently extended to include an attracting cycles. Today there are many definitions, usually meaning an invariant set (of some kind) that is approached uniformly (in some sense) by the forward orbits of all (or most) points in some neighborhood of the set.

Attractors do not occur explicitly in the work of Poincaré or Birkhoff. These authors were primarily interested in Hamiltonian systems, which have no attractors because they preserve volume.

An early proof of existence of a unique attracting periodic orbit for a general class of systems is in the 1942 paper of N. Levinson and O. Smith [23].³

³Thanks to George Sell for this reference.

Early computer simulations revealed what appear to be attractors. As far back as 1952, Turing [49] published pictures of numerical simulations of a nonlinear dynamical model of cell development, exhibiting striking pattern formation. Simulations by Stein & Ulam [44, 45] and Lorenz [24] gave persuasive pictorial evidence of complicated structure in attractors, but attracted little attention when they were published. Hamming’s review [15] of [45] was unenthusiastic:

Many photographs of cathode ray tube displays are given, a fondness for citing large numbers of iterations and machine time used is revealed, and a crude classification of the limited results is offered, but there appears to be no firm new results of general mathematical interest. . .

One can only wonder what will happen to mathematics if we allow the undigested outputs of computers to fill our literature. The present paper shows only slight traces of any digestion of the computer output.

Much of the early theoretical work on attractors on global analysis was concerned with characterizing them in terms of Liapunov functions and topological dynamics (e.g., Ura [50], Auslander *et al.* [2], Mendelson [25], Bhatia [3]). Little was known of their internal dynamics beyond the existence of fixed points in global attractors for flows in Euclidean space (Bhatia & Szegö [5]).

In the 1960s a number of articles on attractors and related forms of stability were inspired by Sell [37]. In his seminal 1967 work on global analysis, Smale gave detailed constructions and analyses of hyperbolic attractors and other invariant sets, which would later be called “chaotic” and “fractal”, and proved them structurally stable. He called attention to the vast mixture of periodic, almost periodic, homoclinic and other phenomena found in structurally stable attractors, even in rather simply given systems.

“Strange attractors” were proposed in 1971 as a model of turbulence by Ruelle and Takens [35, 36, 32], Newhouse *et al.* [29]). The physical significance of this route to chaos is still debated.

In his controversial 1972 book on morphogenesis ([46, 47]) the late René Thom issued a bold manifesto proclaiming the fundamental scientific role of attractors:

1. Every object, or every physical form, can be represented by an *attractor* C of a dynamical system in a space M of *internal variables*.
2. Such an object possesses no stability, and for this reason cannot be perceived, unless the corresponding attractor is *structurally stable*.
3. Every creation or destruction of forms, every morphogenesis, can be described by the disappearance of the attractors representing the initial forms and their replacement through capture by the attractors representing the final forms. This process, called *catastrophe*, can be described in a space of *external variables*. . . .

In recent years much work has been devoted to analysis of attractors in specific classes of chaotic systems, such as those named after Duffing, Lorenz, Hénon and Chua, and to attractors having particular topological properties, such as R. Williams’ expanding attractors

(Williams [52], Plykin & Zhurov [31]). A novel measure-theoretic type of attractor due to Milnor [27] has stimulated several papers.

Many authors have investigated attractors in infinite-dimensional systems, especially for partial differential equations, a prime desideratum being finite dimensional global attractors. The large literature includes books by Constantin *et al.* [11], Hale [14], Ladyzhenskaya [22], Ruelle [33], Sell & You [38], and others.

Attractors, being objects defined by topological limiting processes, resist classification and even description. A general theory appears quite distant.

References

- [1] E. Akin, “The general topology of dynamical systems.” Providence: American Mathematical Society (1993)
- [2] J. Auslander, N.P. Bhatia & P. Seibert, Attractors in dynamical systems, *Boletín Soc. Mat. Mex.* (2) **9** (1964), 55–66
- [3] N. Bhatia, On asymptotic stability in dynamical systems, *Math. Systems. Theory* **1** (1967), 113–128
- [4] H. Bothe, Review of Milnor [27], *Math. Reviews*.
- [5] N. Bhatia & G. Szegő, Weak attractors in R^n , *Math. Systems. Theory* **1** (1967), 129–133
- [6] V. Chepyzhov & M. Vishik. “Attractors for equations of mathematical physics.” American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 49. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (2002)
- [7] J. Cholewa & T. Dłotko, “Global attractors in abstract parabolic problems.” London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 278. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press (2000)
- [8] S. N. Chow & J. K. Hale, “Methods of bifurcation theory.” New York: Springer-Verlag (1982)
- [9] E.A. Coddington & N. Levinson, *Theory of ordinary differential equations*. New York: McGraw Hill (1955).
- [10] C.C. Conley, “Isolated Invariant Sets and the Morse Index.” Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences by the American Mathematical Society, Regional conference series in mathematics, No. 38, Providence (1978)

- [11] P. Constantin, C. Foias, B. Nicolaenko, R. Temam, “Integral manifolds and inertial manifolds for dissipative partial differential equations.” Applied Mathematical Sciences, 70. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1989.
- [12] J.L. Gouze, Positive and negative circuits in dynamical systems, J. Biol. Sys., **6** (1998) 11–15.
- [13] K.P. Hadeler & D. Glas, Quasimonotone systems and convergence to equilibrium in a population genetic model, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **95** (1983), 297-303
- [14] J.K. Hale, “Asymptotic behavior of dissipative systems.” Math. Surveys and Monographs **25**. Providence, R.I.: Amer. Math. Soc. (1988)
- [15] R. Hamming, Review of Stein & Ulam [45]. Math. Reviews # 6666 **29** (1965), 1248.
- [16] M.W. Hirsch, Systems of differential equations which are competitive or cooperative. I: limit sets. SIAM J. Math. Anal. **13** (1982), 167–179
- [17] M.W. Hirsch, The dynamical systems approach to differential equations, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **11** (1984), 1–64
- [18] M.W. Hirsch, Stability and convergence in strongly monotone dynamical systems, J. reine und angewandte Mathematik **383** (1988), 1–53
- [19] M.W. Hirsch, Chain transitive sets for smooth strongly monotone dynamical systems, Dyn. Contin. Discrete Impulsive Systems, **5** (1999), No.1-4, 529–543
- [20] M.W. Hirsch & H.L. Smith, Monotone Dynamical Systems, “Handbook of Differential Equations: Ordinary Differential Equations, Vol. 2.” A. Cañada, P. Drábek & A. Fonda editors, 239–258. Boston: Elsevier North Holland (2005)
- [21] E. Kamke, Zur Theorie der Systeme gewöhnlicher Differentialgleichungen II, Acta Math. **58** (1932), 57-85.
- [22] O. Ladyzhenskaya, “Attractors for semigroups and evolution equations,” Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press (1991)
- [23] N. Levinson & O. Smith, A general equation for relaxation oscillations, Duke Math. J. **9** (1942), 382–403
- [24] E. Lorenz, Deterministic nonperiodic flows, J. Atmos. Sci. **20** (1963), 130-141
- [25] P. Mendelson, On unstable attractors, Boletín Soc. Mat. Mex. (2) **5** (1960), 270-276
- [26] J. Mierczyński, A remark on M. W. Hirsch’s paper “Chain transitive sets for smooth strongly monotone dynamical systems,” Dynam. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Systems **7** (2000), 455-461.

- [27] J. Milnor, On the concept of attractor. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **99** (1985), 177–195
- [28] M. Müller, Über das fundamentaltheorem in der theorie der gewöhnlichen differentialgleichungen, *Math. Zeit.* 26 (1926), 619-645.
- [29] S. Newhouse, D. Ruelle & F. Takens, Occurrence of strange Axiom A attractors near quasiperiodic flows on T^m , $m \geq 3$, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **64** (1978-79), 35-40.
- [30] S. Pigolotti, S. Krishna, and M.H. Jensen, Oscillation patterns in negative feedback loops, *Proc. National Acad. Sci. USA* **104** (2007) 6533-6537.
- [31] R.V. Plykin & A. Zhirov, Some problems of attractors of dynamical systems, *Topology Appl.* **54** (1993), 19–46
- [32] D. Ruelle, Strange attractors as a mathematical explanation of turbulence, *Statistical models and turbulence* (Proc. Sympos., Univ. California, La Jolla, Calif., 1971). *Lecture Notes in Physics* vol. 12. Berlin: Springer-Verlag (1972).
- [33] D. Ruelle, “Turbulence, strange attractors, and chaos.” *World Scientific Series on Nonlinear Science. Series A: Monographs and Treatises*, 16. River Edge, NJ: World Scientific Publishing Co. (1995)
- [34] D. Ruelle, Small random perturbations of dynamical systems and the definition of attractors, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **82** (1981-82), 137–151.
- [35] D. Ruelle & F. Takens, On the nature of turbulence, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **20** (1971), 167-192.
- [36] D. Ruelle & F. Takens, Note concerning our paper: ”On the nature of turbulence”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **23** (1971), 343-344
- [37] G. Sell, Periodic solutions and asymptotic stability, *J. Differential Equations* **2** (1966), 143–157
- [38] G. Sell & Y. You, “Dynamics of Evolutionary Equations.” *Applied Mathematical Sciences*, 143. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [39] S. Smale, Differentiable dynamical systems, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **73** (1967), 747-817.
- [40] H. L. Smith and H. R. Thieme, Convergence for strongly ordered preserving semi-flows, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 22 (1991), 1081-1101.
- [41] E. H. Snoussi, Necessary conditions for multistationarity and stable periodicity, *J. Biol. Syst.* **6** (1998) 3-9.
- [42] E.D. Sontag. Monotone and near-monotone biochemical networks, *Systems and Synthetic Biology* **1** (2007) 59–87.

- [43] E.D. Sontag, A. Veliz-Cuba, R. Laubenbacher, and A.S. Jarrah, The effect of negative feedback loops on the dynamics of boolean networks, submitted, 2007.
- [44] P.R. Stein & S.M. Ulam, Quadratic transformations, Part I. Los Alamos Report LA2305. Washington: Office of Technical Services, U.S. Department of Commerce (1959).
- [45] P.R. Stein & S.M. Ulam, Non-linear transformation studies on electronic computers. *Rozprawy Matematyczne* vol. xxxix. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe (1964).
- [46] R. Thom, “Stabilité structurelle et morphogénèse; essai d’une théorie generale des modèles.” Reading, Mass.: W. A. Benjamin (1972)
- [47] R. Thom, “Structural stability and morphogenesis; an outline of a general theory of models.” Reading, Mass.: W. A. Benjamin (1975).
- [48] R. Thomas, On the relation between the logical structure of systems and their ability to generate multiple steady states or sustained oscillations, *Springer Ser. Synergetics*, **9**, (1981) 180–193.
- [49] A.M. Turing, The chemical basis of morphogenesis, *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. B* **237** (1952), 37-72
- [50] T. Ura, Sur les courbes définies par les equations differentielles dans l’espace à m dimensions, *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. (3)* **70** (1953), 287-360
- [51] L. Ward, Partially ordered topological spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **5** (1954) 144–161
- [52] R.F. Williams, Expanding attractors, *Colloque de Topologie Différentielle (Mont-Aigoual, 1969)*, 79-89. Montpellier: Université de Montpellier